

Questions from Commission for DRC:

- 1) Are the concerns regarding the aluminum clad mainly a concern regarding repair vs. replace?
- 2) What are the materials concerns regarding the aluminum clad as far as wear and tear, how it looks etc.?
- 3) The DRC Summary states “After field inspection, the DRC determined that most, if not all, of the windows on the façade can be repaired.... “

There were notes from Heather about the April 7, 2009 tour of windows with Karin Link and Alex Rolluda. From the notes it appeared you visited 5 sites but could not see the condition of the windows because they were covered by displays. There were no notes about the condition of any windows, sills, or walls. Did the DRC members visit the same five sites (Magic Shop, Mastercraft Leather, Pike Place Gifts, Holy Cow, and Golden Age Collectables)? How many windows were inspected by the DRC? How did the DRC make the determination “that most, if not all of the windows could be repaired?”

There seems to be concern among Commissioners that there hasn't been adequate “proof” or documentation that a great majority of the windows proposed to be replaced are in “bad”(14) or “very bad” (42) condition. Is the Survey of Existing Conditions, Revised November 2 sufficient? Do we need more information about the definition used to categorize the windows, or another review by a 3rd party?

Did any Commissioners, other than Sue Zuege and Sharron Shinbo see the windows in the Constituency office? It was easy to see rotting sashes, ample mold growth, windows that would not close water damage on sills and along the base of the wall. The appearance of mold and smell strong smell of mildew caused by continuous water intrusion coupled with the failing interior putty containing asbestos did not leave the impression that this office was, in any way, a healthy work environment for tenants or the public. Did the DRC see these windows and consider them repairable?

- 4) Many of the concerns expressed by the DRC relate to the sub points in Section 3.1 General Principles for Design in the Market. The statement that precedes the sub points as the important, overarching “umbrella” statement of the Commission's responsibility when making judgments of design. The sub points that follow are guidelines, not directives, which is why “should” is used more often than “must.”

"The Commission is responsible for making those judgments of design which assure that the character of the Market is preserved and that the architectural, cultural, economic and historical qualities of the District are maintained. Many of the elements that establish the character and quality of the District must adapt harmoniously to changing market activities. The following guidelines shall be used as a basis for decision-making on the approval of a design with consideration give to historical precedent. (underline mine).

We all understand the windows are an important character of the façade. We do not all agree that the design of the current windows from the 1970's is "historical." However, we can agree that the activities behind the windows have changed. The current pivot windows have been described as reminiscent of the former warehousing functions of the market. Today, and in the future, we want to maintain a more efficient, historical structure that does not function as a warehouse. Today we have the diversity of small owner operated businesses, larger successful businesses that have grown within the market, and a vitally important childcare center. We have heard the public testimony and seen the survey of the tenants. They say the current pivot window are heavy, unsafe for children and the general public (falling glass and items from restaurants), difficult to operate, and do not protect the children and tenants from cold in the winter and heat in the summer. Isn't the Commission's design challenge to think about the windows in a way that will "adapt harmoniously to changing market activities" to better serve the tenants' and general publics' needs?"